

Appln. No.: 09/892,611
Amendment dated December 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005

filed June 28, 2005. However, for succinctness, Applicants discuss herein only the primary and most obvious deficiencies of the rejection.

All independent claims recite an “access router.” At the outset, Applicants point out that *neither La Porta nor Rom even describe or suggest the use of access routers*. While La Porta indicates that “base stations maintain or access router capabilities,” La Porta does not refer to an “access router” device, but rather refers to a base station that accesses a router’s capabilities. La Porta uses the word “access” as a verb, not a noun. Rom does not even contain the term “access router.” Thus, Applicants are at a loss to understand how the rejection can be maintained in view of the fact that neither reference even describes or suggests the use of access routers.

Second, as previously argued in the Amendment filed June 28, 2005, the access points of Rom are completely different from the claimed access routers. Access points are intra-domain bridge devices (i.e., used within a single domain), whereas Access routers are inter-domain devices (i.e., used to interconnect and route traffic among multiple domains). Those of skill in the art understand them to have different functions, different hardware, and different purposes. They are simply not interchangeable as implied by the Office Action, and thus there is no motivation to combine the references in the first place.

Finally, the Office Action does not rebut Applicants’ previous arguments with respect to dependent claims, but rather appears to indicate that once an independent claim is rejected, the dependent claims can be summarily dismissed. For example:

- Applicants previously argued that with respect to claim 20, Rom does not teach or suggest that the capability information comprises security schemes supported by one of the routers. The Final Office Action does not even attempt to rebut this assertion.
- Applicants previously argued that with respect to claim 22, La Porta does not teach or suggest that the capability information comprises signal transmission technologies supported by a base station associated with one of the access routers. The Final Office Action does not even attempt to rebut this assertion.
- Applicants previously argued that with respect to claim 23 and 27, Rom does not teach or suggest that the capability information comprises a cost of access for

Appln. No.: 09/892,611
Amendment dated December 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005

using one of the access routers. The Final Office Action does not even attempt to rebut this assertion.

- Applicants previously argued that with respect to claim 25, La Porta does not teach purging capability information based on an elapsed period of time. The Final Office Action does not even attempt to rebut this assertion.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 20 day of Dec, 2005

By: /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/mmd